



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,212	11/30/2000	Chade-Meng Tan	GOOGLE-6	3484

26479 7590 08/24/2005

STRAUB & POKOTYLO  
620 TINTON AVENUE  
BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR  
TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724

EXAMINER
----------

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,212

Applicant(s)

TAN ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D. Campbell

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-11 and 13-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 9, 15-17, 21 and 23-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18-20, 22 and 30-33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 06/09/2005.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-33 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 15, 21, and 23-26 are independent claims. Claims 7 and 12 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 23-26 have been amended. Claims 27-33 have been newly added.
3. The rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. has been withdrawn due to amendments.
4. The rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 14, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite has been withdrawn due to amendments.
5. The rejection of claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite has been withdrawn due to amendments.
6. The rejection of claims 1, 9, 15, and 18-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mr. Cluey ("How can I find out how many hyperlinks there are on a page?" published on September 10, 2000) has been withdrawn due to amendments.
7. The rejection of claims 2-4, 6, 10, 11, 14, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mr. Cluey ("How can I find out how many hyperlinks there are on a page?" published on September 10, 2000) as applied to claims 1, 9, and 15 above, and further in view of Roberts et al. (hereinafter Roberts, US Patent Number 6,344,851, filed on November 30, 1998) has been withdrawn due to amendments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15-17, 21, 24, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "objectionable" in claim 15, 21, 24, 26 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "objectionable" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The term "objectionable" in this case could hold different interpretations, but in the case of dependent claims 18-20 and 22, the term "objectionable" is defined based on the limitations involving the criterion that classifies a navigation bar as "objectionable". The examiner suggests moving the limitations of claims 18-20 and/or 22 into the claims that they depend on to overcome this rejection. In the rejected claims the term "objectionable navigation bar" will be interpreted as meaning a collection of links that is not actually a navigation bar. Proper correction is required.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18-20, 22, and 30-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claims 16 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

12. Claims 1, 4, 9, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter Jamtgaard, US Patent Number 6,430,624, filed February 14, 2000).

**Regarding independent claim 1**, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which a document is segmented into components and the anchors and non-anchor text of the components are analyzed (column 2, line 40-column 3, line 9 and column 5, line 7-column 6, line 31 of Jamtgaard). The component is then re-authored based on that analysis (column 2, line 40-column 3, line 9 of Jamtgaard).

**Regarding dependent claim 4**, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which re-authoring effectively reformats the document to be rendered on a smaller display (column 2, line 40-column 3, line 9 of Jamtgaard).

**Regarding dependent claim 9**, Jamtgaard discloses a method wherein the document is broken into components using a Document Object Model (DOM tree) which corresponds to a parent-child hierarchy (column 3, line 9 and column 5, line 7-column 6, line 31 of Jamtgaard).

**Regarding independent claim 23**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

**Regarding independent claim 25**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

**Regarding dependent claims 27**, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which re-authoring includes converting the document from HTML to WML (column 2, line 40-column 3, line 9 and column 5, line 7-column 6, line 31 of Jamtgaard).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

14. Claims 15, 21, 24, 26, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter Jamtgaard, US Patent Number 6,430,624, filed February 14, 2000).

**Regarding independent claim 15**, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which a document is segmented into components and the anchors and non-anchor text of the components are analyzed (column 2, line 40-column 3, line 9 and column 5, line 7-column 6, line 31 of Jamtgaard). Jamtgaard discloses a method wherein the document is broken into components using a Document Object Model (DOM tree) which corresponds to a parent-child hierarchy (column 2, line 40-column 3, line 9 and column 5, line 7-column 6, line 31 of Jamtgaard). Jamtgaard also discloses that it is determined if a component is a navigation bar (column 8, line 55-column 9, line 39 of Jamtgaard). The component is then re-authored based the analysis (column 8, line 55-column 9, line 39 of Jamtgaard). Jamtgaard does not disclose a method in which it is determined that the navigation bar is objectionable or not. However, Jamtgaard can make a determination as to whether or not a collection of links is a navigation bar or not (column 8, line 55-column 9, line 39 of Jamtgaard), and thus it would have been obvious based on the broadest possible limitation that if a determination is made that a collection of links is actually a navigation bar then it is also determined to not be objectionable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have used the method of Jamtgaard to locate objectionable navigation bars based on the broadest possible definition of that phrase because it would have allowed non-navigation bar collections of links to be disqualified and not placed on every page in the re-authored document group.

**Regarding independent claim 21**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 15. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 15.

**Regarding independent claim 24**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 15. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 15.

**Regarding independent claim 26**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 15. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 15.

**Regarding dependent claims 28 and 29**, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which re-authoring includes converting the document from HTML to WML (column 8, line 55-column 9, line 39 of Jamtgaard).

### ***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 9, 15, 21, and 23-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

16. Applicant's arguments, see pages 19-23, filed 6/9/2005, with respect to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-20, 22, and 30-33 have been fully considered and are



persuasive. The rejection has been withdrawn due to the amendments and no new rejection has been applied, the claims are deemed to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, until then an objection of the claims stands based on the fact that a rejection exists for the base claims which the allowable claims depend on.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/727,212

Page 9

Art Unit: 2178

August 18, 2005

*William L. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
8/21/2005